



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**



Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Summary Report

MA-128

Napili 2-3 Desilting Basin

Maui, Hawaii

Prepared by:

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
HONOLULU ENGINEER DISTRICT**

**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

May 2006

Limited Visual Dam Safety Inspection Conducted on: 04 April 2006

I. Purpose

Due to disaster occurrences of periodic heavy rains and flooding, which has caused extensive damage to property and loss of lives, the Governor has issued a State of Emergency Proclamation extending from February 20, 2006 to April 9, 2006. In light of the tragic failure of the Kaloko dam on Kauai and the continued forecast of heavy rains, emergency inspections of all regulated dams in all counties are being undertaken.

These inspections are for the purpose of determining if any of the regulated dams and reservoirs in the City and County of Honolulu, Maui County or Hawaii County, are suspect for immediate concern to the downstream area under the prolonged conditions of heavy rain showers.

II. Authority

Inspections are authorized under the Hawaii Dam Safety Act of 1987, Chapter 179D "Dams and Reservoirs" of Hawaii Revised Statutes, and Title 13, Subtitle 7, Chapter 190, "Dams and Reservoirs" of the Hawaii Administrative Rules.

These inspections are being conducted under joint agreements of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the State of Hawaii. The Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is entered into pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 3036(d)(2), and the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act (31 U.S.C. §6505), and established via support agreement number DL-06-01.

III. Scope

Visual inspection will be made on parts of the embankment and appurtenant works readily available and visible for inspection by the inspection team at the time of the inspection. Such parts and appurtenant works would include the upstream slope, crest, downstream slope, abutments and toes, outlet works, and spillway.

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there may appear to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam, however no assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

IV. Limitations of Findings and Recommendations

The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. The inspection does not entail detailed stability, hydrologic, hydraulic, or seismic investigations. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies.

V. Inspection Team

| <u>Organization</u> | <u>Name /Title</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Jon Kolber Geotechnical Engineer |
| State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources | Eric Yuasa Civil Engineer |
| USDA, Natural Resource Conservation Service | Diana Perry Civil Engineer |
| USDA, Natural Resource Conservation Service | Michael Hayama Civil Engineer |

VI. Owner's Representatives Present

| | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Maui County | Leonard Costa Ed Bonnell |
|-------------|-----------------------------|

VII. Summary Report Team

| <u>Organization</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|--|--------------------------------|
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Derek Chow Bill Empson |
| State of Hawaii, Dept. of Land and Natural Resources | Denise Manuel Edwin Matsuda |

VIII. Dam Type

The dam appeared to be an earthen embankment dam.

IX. Dam Classification

The current hazard classification of this dam is: High

Hazard Potential Classification based on the following:

| Category | Loss of Life | Economic Loss |
|-------------|--|---|
| Low | None Expected | Minimal (undeveloped to occasional structures or agriculture) |
| Significant | Few (No Urban development and no more than a small number of inhabitable structures) | Appreciable (Notable agriculture, industry or structures) |
| High | More than a few | Extensive community, industry or agriculture. |

Based on inventoried storage and height data, the size classification of the dam is: Most likely Small.

Size Classification based on the following:

| Category | Storage (Acre-Feet) | Height (feet) |
|--------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Small | < 1000 | < 40 |
| Intermediate | > 1000 and < 50,000 | > 40 and < 100 |
| Large | > 50,000 | > 100 |

X. Summary of Inspection

Condition Rating Criteria: The conditional terms in this report are used to generally describe the conditions below. Inspections, monitoring, and additional investigations are considered to be incidental to all condition ratings.

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Satisfactory | Expected to fulfill intended function. |
| Fair | Expected to fulfill intended function, but maintenance is recommended. |
| Poor | May not fulfill intended function; maintenance or repairs are necessary. |
| Unsatisfactory | Is not expected to fulfill intended function; repair, replacement, or modification is necessary. |
| Unknown | Not visible, not accessible, not inspected, or unable to determine the condition rating based on the observation taken. |

A. General appearance:

This reservoir was completed in 1988 and continues to operate as a siltation control structure. The dam is 40 feet high and 660 feet long. This reservoir also serves as a water hazard on the Kapalua Bay Golf Course.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
- b. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- c. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
- d. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- e. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- f. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
- g. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
- h. Emergency Alarms / Monitors: There were no alarms or monitors observed on this reservoir.
- i. Power / Communication: There were no communication systems observed on this reservoir.

B. Access / Security:

Access to the dam was accomplished by driving and parking adjacent to the dam/golf course. A four-wheel drive vehicle is not required.

Security issues. Access to the dam is unrestricted.

C. Intake Works: (Unknown)

The intake works consist of a stream, which was not inspected.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The intake works were not inspected.
- b. The intake works were not tested.

D. Reservoir: (Fair)

The reservoir was estimated to be approximately 6 feet deep at the time of inspection. The normal operating level is estimated to be 6 to 7 feet. No staff gage was observed.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- b. A staff gage was not observed at this reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.

E. Upstream Slope: (Satisfactory)

The upstream slope is on an approximate 3 on 1 slope.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.

F. Crest: (Satisfactory)

The dam crest was approximately 20 feet wide with low ground cover.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.
- b. Access along the crest was satisfactory.

G. Downstream Slope: (Satisfactory)

The downstream slope is covered with low ground cover at an approximate 3 on 1 slope.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.

H. Abutments / Toe: (Satisfactory)

The abutments/toe were inspected and appear to be in satisfactory condition.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.

I. Outlet Works: (Unsatisfactory)

The outlet works were not tested. The outlet works consist of a DIP, which was not inspected and has not been opened ever because it could flood downstream homes, per the owner. Flow is managed through the spillway.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The outlet works were not inspected.
- b. The outlet works were not tested.
- c. The outlet works appear to be in unsatisfactory condition and are not expected to fulfill its intended function.
- d. Outlet works valve is broken per owner.

J. Spillway: (Satisfactory)

This spillway consisted of a concrete U wall channel approximately 18 feet wide by 7 feet high. When the water level in the reservoir reaches the elevation of the spillway, it flows out, uncontrolled.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition. No corrective actions are required at this time.

K. Down Stream Channel: (Unknown)

A downstream channel carries flow from the spillway to the ocean.

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- a. The downstream channel was not inspected.

XI. Additional Comments:

Based on visual observations and discussion of operational procedures of the day, there is no immediate threat to the safety of the dam at this time.

County of Maui has requested that reservoir be drained.

PHOTOGRAPHS

MA-127 Napili 2 & 3 Desilting Basin

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Crest

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Downslope

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Downstream – view from the crest looking downstream

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Outlet – view of dam outlet channel

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Reservoir - This is also a water hazard for the Maui Golf Course

MA-128 Napili 2 and 3 Desilting Basin



128 Upslope

FIELD INSPECTION SHEETS

Dam ID: MA-0128
NAPILI 2-3 DESILTING BASIN

Vulnerability Index:
Extreme High Moderate Low
1 2 3 4

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/04/2006

STATE OF HAWAII - DLNR
DAM SAFETY INSPECTION SHEET

Inspection Type: Visual Dam Safety Inspection

Persons Present

Affiliation

Phone Number

Jon Kolber
Leonard Costa
Ed Bonnell
Eric Yuasa
Diana Perry
Michael Hayama

US Army Corps of Engineers
County of Maui
" " "
Hawaii DLNR
USDA- NRCS
" "

Weather Condition: ☐ Rain previous day ☐ Rainy ☐ Drizzle / Mist ☐ Cloudy/Overcast ☐ Partly Cloudy ☒ Sunny ☐ Dry

Comments: _____

1. General: (Information currently on file, update as required)

Dam/Res. Name NAPILI 2-3 DESILTING BASIN (In Kapahua Bay Golf Course)
Owner Maui County, Department of Public Works (C021)
Owner Contact Mr. Leonard B. Costa Owner Ph. _____
Lessee N/A Lessee Ph. _____
O & M Contractor Owner O & M Ph. _____
Nearest Town NAPILI Latitude 20.9967 ° (decimal)
County MAUI Longitude 156.665 ° (decimal)
Tax Map Key(s) _____

Dam Status A: Hazard Potential H: Dam Size _____
Year Completed 1988 Dam Length 660 ft. Dam Height 40 ft.
Normal Storage 17 ac.ft. Max. Storage 57 ac.ft. Max. Surface Area 2.1 ac.
Drainage Area 0.458 mi. Spillway Type _____ Max. Spillway Q 3580 cfs

Owner owns land under dam facility: _____

Emergency Action Plan on file with the Department: YES

Reports on file with the Department: July 1996 = Dam Safety Inspection, Woodward Clyde & Assoc. (7)

2. Questions for Owner's Rep.:

Yes No Unknown Comments

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Construction Plans Available | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Constructed under Honolulu Watershed Project</u> |
| Site / Facility Map | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Operation & Maintenance Manual | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Emergency Action Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Modifications / Improvements | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Conduct Routine Inspections | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Conduct Routine Maintenance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Vehicle access to site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive |
| Access during heavy rains | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive |
| Access when spillway is flowing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Not accessible <input type="checkbox"/> With Standard car <input type="checkbox"/> Requires 4-Wheel Drive |
| Other Studies Conducted | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Phase I <input type="checkbox"/> Phase II <input type="checkbox"/> Hydraulics <input type="checkbox"/> Stability <input type="checkbox"/> Hazard <input type="checkbox"/> Seismic <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| Incident History | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Breached <input type="checkbox"/> Overtop <input type="checkbox"/> Slide <input type="checkbox"/> Down stream Flooding <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| Reservoir's Current Use | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sediment <input type="checkbox"/> Irrigation <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Flood Control <input type="checkbox"/> Drinking Water <input type="checkbox"/> Power Generation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Water hazard for Maui Golf Course</u> |

Findings and Corrective Actions:

- ☒ a. The Owner shall maintain documentations including Construction plans, specifications, improvements, modifications, Operations and Maintenance Manuals and routine inspection logs for this dam facility.
- ☐ b. An Emergency Action Plan (EAP) is on file with the department, submit any updates as applicable.
- ☒ c. An EAP is required for High Hazard Dams. Submit an updated EAP for this facility.
- ☐ d. An EAP is recommended for all dams regardless of hazard class. Submit EAP if developed for the facility.
- ☐ e. Submit narrative and additional information detailing the improvements, modifications, and/or alterations at the dam site, unless covered by approved dam permit.
- ☒ f. Routine inspection logs were not inspected.
- ☒ g. Dam owners shall provide for routine inspection of the dam.
- ☐ h. The dam did not appear to be maintained on a regular basis.
- ☒ i. Access to site appears to be satisfactory.
- ☐ j. There is no vehicular access to the dam site. Operational and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ k. Access to dam is questionable during severe weather conditions and/or spillway overflows. Operational plans and emergency plans need to reflect this deficiency or access provided.
- ☐ l. Provide a detailed narrative of the incident, responses taken, and any damages incurred. Dam owners are required to promptly advise the department of any sudden or unprecedented flood or unusual or alarming circumstance or occurrences which may adversely affect the dam or reservoir.
- ☒ m. Submit current Operations and Maintenance Manual or Procedures for this dam / reservoir facility.
- ☒ n. Submit Site or Facility Map of this Dam which identifies the location of major features including outlet works controls and conduits.
- ☐ o. _____

Additional Requirements:

The following investigative study(s) are:

Required Recommended

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | Phase I Study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Phase II Study (Including <input type="checkbox"/> Seepage <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Hydraulics <input type="checkbox"/> EAP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology and Hydraulics (including Probable Maximum Flood and spillway capacity) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Stability Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Seismic Analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazard Classification |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: _____ |

Physical Dam Features: (Check All Applicable. Provide description of Items Observed and/or Take Photos. Indicate photo # in description.)

3. Reservoir:

Level during inspection ~6' ft per Eye (gage / other)

Normal Operating Level/Range 6'-9' ft per Eye (gage / other)

Description: Water level was just below spillway elevation

Typical Operation ☐ Spillway always flowing ☐ Kept within normal range ☐ Kept Empty ☐ Drained Daily ☒ Only filled by Storms

☐ Other: _____

Sinkhole in Res.: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ by _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Staff Gage: Description: None

Findings:

- ☐ a. The reservoir was not inspected.
☐ b. The reservoir appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☒ c. The reservoir appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The reservoir appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. The staff gage needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☒ f. A staff gage was not observed at the reservoir. Provide some method of quantifying the water level within the reservoir.
☐ g. A sinkhole was observed in the upstream reservoir. Conduct additional investigations and monitoring to identify the cause, risk and appropriate action.
☐ h. _____

4. Intake Works Description:

☒ Number of Intakes 1

☐ Intake Culvert / Pipe

Size: _____ in. ☐ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☒ Other Stream channel

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other _____

☐ Ditch / Flume

Dimension: _____ (Size x Depth) Shape _____

Surface: ☐ Dirt ☐ Wood ☐ Concrete ☐ Lined w/ _____

Control: ☐ Gate ☐ Valve ☐ Flow can either be Shut off or Bypassed

From: ☐ Stream Diversion ☐ Pump ☐ Reservoir ☐ Other _____

Findings:

- ☒ a. The intake works were not inspected.
☒ b. The intake works were not tested.
☐ c. The intake works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ d. The intake works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ e. The intake works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition, urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ f. The intake works needs maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
☐ g. _____

Dam ID: MA-0128
NAPILI 2-3 DESILTING BASIN

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/04/2006

5. Upstream Slope:

(Typical Slope \pm 3 : 1)

Slope Protection: ☒ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Liner _____ ☐ Other: _____

☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ # Observed: _____ Size: _____ and _____ Depth ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The upstream slope was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The upstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The upstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The upstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ i. The upstream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ j. Tree(s) were observed on the dam embankment. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ k. _____

6. Crest:

Approximate Crest Width: 20'

Access: ☐ None ☒ Walking Path ☐ Roadway, Surface / Width / Usage: _____
Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____
Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____
Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____
Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The dam crest was not inspected.
☒ b. The dam crest appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The dam crest appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The dam crest appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Access along the crest was satisfactory.
☐ f. Access along the crest was not possible. Description: _____
☐ g. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the crest, which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
☐ h. A crack was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
☐ i. A sinkhole was observed on the crest, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
☐ j. Portions of the crest were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
☐ k. Tree(s) were observed along the dam crest. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
☐ l. _____

7. Downstream Slope:

(Typical Slope \pm 3 : 1)

Access: ☐ lower roadway along toe ☒ roadway to outlet works ☒ walkway to outlet works ☐ None Observed

Slope Protection: ☒ None ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☐ Concrete

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Sinkholes: ☐ _____ in. Wide x _____ in. Long x _____ in. Deep ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"

Description: _____

Seepage: Seep Spot Number 1

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2

☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

☐ Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The downstream slope was not inspected.
- ☒ b. The downstream slope appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The downstream slope appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The downstream slope appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed on the slope, which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. A sinkhole was observed on the slope, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Repair and monitor the area.
- ☐ i. The down stream slope was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ g. Tree(s) were observed on the downstream slope. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ h. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ i. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
- ☐ j. The slope was very steep, around a 1 to 1 slope, further study is required to verify slope stability.
- ☐ k. _____

8. Abutments/Toe:

Erosion: ☐ Loose soil w/ little vegetation ☐ Rut (<6") ☐ Gully (>6" deep) ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____

Cracks: ☐ Parallel with crest ☐ Perpendicular to crest ☐ Slide visible ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
Description: _____

Vegetation: ☐ None ☒ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Seepage: Seep Spot Number 1
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☒ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Seep Spot Number 2
☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed
☐ Flowing, Description: _____
Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☐ a. The abutments/toe were not inspected.
- ☒ b. The abutments/toe appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
- ☐ c. The abutments/toe appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
- ☐ d. The abutments/toe appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
- ☐ f. Rut and/or Gully erosion was observed, which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
- ☐ g. A crack was observed along the abutments/near the toe, which requires further investigation to determine the underlining cause. Monitor the area and/or repair as required.
- ☐ h. The abutment/toe area was not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☐ i. Tree(s) were observed along the abutment/toe. Trees have been identified as the probably cause of piping failures, and can possibly cause sever damage to the embankment if they are uprooted during a high winds. Corrective action is required to remove the tree hazards from the dam. Acceptable remedies include removal of the tree and its root structure down to a 2" diameter and reconstructing the damaged embankment section. All repair work shall be accomplished as per the requirements of licensed geotechnical or structural engineer. Routinely monitor the damaged area for signs of settlement and seepage.
- ☐ j. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Monitor and conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ k. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil from the embankment. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area.
- ☐ l. _____

9. Outlet Works:

Culvert / Pipe

Type / Size: NOT INSPECTED

Culvert: ☐ Concrete ☐ Masonry ☐ unlined earth ☐ Other _____

Pipe: ☒ DIP ☐ Corrugated Metal ☐ PVC ☐ HDPE ☐ Concrete ☐ Other _____

Control Type: ☐ Gate ☒ Valve ☐ Other Not opened (ever) - could flood

Location: ☐ Control on Upstream side ☒ Control on Downstream side downstream homes

Seepage: ☐ Green Vegetation ☐ Wet or Muddy Ground ☐ Ponding Water ☐ Not Visible ☐ None Observed

Flowing, Description: _____

Water Clarity: ☐ Clear ☐ Some particles ☐ Muddy ☐ Other: _____

Description: _____

Findings:

- ☒ a. The outlet works were not inspected.
 - ☒ b. The outlet works were not tested.
 - ☐ c. The outlet works appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
 - ☐ d. The outlet works appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
 - ☒ e. The outlet works appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function.
- ~~Urgent corrective action is required:~~

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ f. Seepage/Ponding water was observed. Conduct further investigation to locate the source of water and extent of any possible hazardous or developing condition.
- ☐ g. Seepage was observed flowing and particles were observed to be removed by the flow. Take immediate action to stop the loss of soil. Conduct further investigation to determine the underlining cause and take corrective action. Monitor the area. Failures caused by seepage/piping along the outlet conduit are very common and are considered to be a dangerous situation.
- ☐ h. Were not visible due to high grass and bush vegetation. Clear high vegetation and maintain low to enable easy visual inspection.
- ☒ i. OUTLET WORKS VALVE IS BROKEN PER OWNER. FLOWS MANAGED THROUGH SPILLWAY.
- ☐ j. _____

10. Spillway:

Type: ☐ None ☐ Culvert/Pipe ☒ Channel
Description: Concrete box culvert for flow to ocean
Dimension: 2' x 18' ft. Invert elevation: _____ ft. per staff gage
Slope Protection: ☐ None ☐ Grass ☐ Dumped Rock ☐ Fitted Rip Rap ☐ Grouted Rip Rap ☒ Concrete
☐ Defect in Protection: Description: _____
Approach: ☒ Clear ☐ High Veg. ☐ Trees ☐ Other: _____
Erosion: ☐ Scour ☐ Gully ☐ Headcut ☒ Not Observed ☐ Other: _____
Description: _____
Vegetation: ☒ None ☐ Low Ground Cover ☐ Bushes or Tall Grass ☐ Trees # _____ ☐ <6" ☐ >6" & <20" ☐ >20"
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☒ a. The Spillway appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ b. The Spillway appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ c. The Spillway appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ d. Slope protection needs maintenance or repair. Description: _____
☐ e. The spillway approach was blocked. Clear approach.
☐ f. Severe scour erosion was observed which requires maintenance and/or repair.
Description: _____
☐ g. A headcut (vertical drop in channel due to erosion) was observed downstream of the spillway. Corrective action is required to prevent this problem from moving upstream.
☐ h. Trees are unacceptable in the spillway channel and approach. Take corrective action to address the woody vegetation problem and repair the damaged area.
☐ i. Unclear if spillway is adequately sized. Spillway should pass the probable maximum flood. Verify spillway capacity and take corrective action as required.
☐ j. _____

11. Down Stream Channel:

Name: Concrete box culvert for flow to ocean
Downstream: ☐ Sump ☐ Open Area ☐ Un-Defined Drainage-way ☐ Defined Drainage-way ☐ Other _____
Items along Stream Bank: ☐ None ☐ Road ☐ Houses ☐ Town ☐ Not Inspected
Description: _____

Findings:

- ☒ a. The downstream channel was not inspected.
☐ b. The downstream channel appeared to be in satisfactory condition, no corrective actions are required at this time.
☐ c. The downstream channel appeared to be in fair to poor condition and requires corrective action.
☐ d. The downstream channel appeared to be in unsatisfactory condition and not expected to fulfill its intended function. Urgent corrective action is required.

Corrective Actions:

- ☐ e. _____

Dam ID: MA-0128
NAPILI 2-3 DESILTING BASIN

Inspection No: _____
Date: 4/04/2006

Additional Comments:

On the date of this limited visual inspection, there appeared to be no immediate threat to the safety of the dam. No assurance can be made regarding the dam's condition after this date. Subsequent adverse weather and other factors may affect the dam's condition.

County of Maui requested that the reservoir be drained.

Limitations and Intent of this Dam Safety Inspection:

This Dam Safety Inspection was conducted to assess the general overall condition of the reservoir/dam, identify visible deficiencies, and recommend areas of for monitoring, additional investigative studies and corrective actions. The inspection is based only on visible features/areas of the dam on the day of inspection. This inspection is not a formal phase I or phase II dam safety inspection and does not include a review or evaluation from each specialist of an inspection team, such as a geologists, civil, geotechnical, structural, or hydraulics engineer. The owner should verify the findings of this report and take corrective actions. The owner may submit to the State alternative corrective actions that are certified by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Hawaii experienced in the design and construction of dams. This inspection does not relieve the owner/operator from their responsibility to conduct routine inspections, maintenance, repairs, modifications, monitoring, documentation, and/or investigative studies. The inspection was conducted under the authority of the Hawaii Revised Statutes Chapter 179D, and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Title 13, Chapter 190, titled "Dams and Reservoirs". Questions regarding this inspection should be forwarded to the Hawaii State Dam Safety Program; PO Box 373; Honolulu, Hawaii 96809; Ph. (808) 587-0236.

Revised: Dec. 1, 2003